

1 Robert J. Lauson, Esq., SBN 175,486  
bob@lauson.com  
2 LAUSON & TARVER LLP  
880 Apollo Street, Suite 301  
3 El Segundo, California 90245  
Tel. (310) 726-0892  
4 Attorneys for Plaintiff,  
Voice International, Inc.  
5  
6 David Grober  
davidgrober1@gmail.com  
7 578 West Washington Blvd., Suite 866  
Marina Del Rey, CA 90292  
Tel. (310) 822-1100  
8 Plaintiff, Pro se  
9 Mark J. Young  
(Fla. Bar No. 0078158)  
10 Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*  
MARK YOUNG, P.A.  
11 1638 Camden Ave.,  
Jacksonville, FL 32207  
12 myoungpa@gmail.com  
13 Attorney for Defendant

Oceanic Production Equip. Ltd.  
James E. Doroshow, Esq.  
SBN 112,920  
j doroshow@foxrothschild.com  
Ashe Puri, Esq. SBN 297,814  
apuri@foxrothschild.com  
FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP  
1800 Century Park East, Suite 300  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-1506  
Tel. (310) 598-4150  
Attorneys for Defendants,  
Oppenheimer Cine Rental, LLC,  
Oppenheimer Camera Products, Inc.,  
and Marty Oppenheimer

14 David A. Peck (Cal. Bar No. 171854)  
COAST LAW GROUP, LLP  
1140 S. Coast Hwy 101, Encinitas,  
CA 92024  
Tel: (760) 942-8505  
Fax: (760) 942-8515  
dpeck@coastlawgroup.com  
15 Attorneys for Defendant  
16 Oceanic Production Equip. Ltd.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA WESTERN DIVISION

16 **VOICE INTERNATIONAL, INC., a  
California corporation; DAVID  
GROBER, an individual,**

17 **Plaintiffs,**

18 **vs.**

19 **OPPENHEIMER CINE RENTAL,  
LLC, et al.,**

20 **Defendants**

21 .

Case No.: 2:15-cv-08830-JAK(KS)

Joint Scheduling Report

Date: Feb. 5, 2018

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Place: Courtroom 10B First Street

22 Pursuant to Dkt. 208 and 216, the parties, Plaintiffs Voice International and  
23 David Grober and Defendants Oppenheimer Cine Rental, LLC, Oppenheimer  
24 Camera Products, Inc., Marty Oppenheimer and Oceanic Production Equipment,  
25 Ltd. met-and-conferred on January 23, 2018 and jointly report to the Court.

26  
27  
28

## **I. Further Mediation**

## **Plaintiffs Grober's and Voice International's Position**

3 The parties are far apart on their offers, such that Plaintiffs believe further  
4 mediation will not be productive presently.

## **Plaintiff Grober's Position**

6 Furthermore, the Kleins and John Dann re-purchased their 5 MakoHeads  
7 when they bankrupted their company, Mako, owned by the Kleins. They continued  
8 MakoHead rentals during the bankruptcy and after, personally or through their new  
9 entity, OPEL, of the Bahamas. An infringement decision is required to prevent  
10 further infringement by the MakoHead or its progeny. Defendants have now placed  
11 into the public record, Smith's declaration, schematics and photographs, including  
12 Plaintiffs' trade secrets, on how to build the device. Dkt. 141-2, 141-3.

## Defendant OPEL's Position

14 Plaintiffs' position set forth in the above paragraph is a gross  
15 mischaracterization and irrelevant to scheduling.

16 Defendant Oceanic Production Equipment, Ltd. (OPEL) disagrees with  
17 Plaintiffs' views regarding mediation. OPEL views Plaintiffs' allegations of  
18 infringement of US Patent 6,611,662 as entirely baseless and considers Plaintiffs'  
19 damages claim to be beyond the pale. In an effort to achieve closure, OPEL has  
20 made reasonable offers of settlement, to no avail. OPEL believes that a mediation  
21 or another settlement conference with Magistrate Judge Karen L. Stevenson may  
22 facilitate settlement by drawing attention to relative weaknesses of the parties' legal  
23 positions.

## **Defendant Oppenheimer's Position**

25 The Oppenheimer Defendants agree with OPEL's recommendation for  
26 further mediation or another settlement conference before the Magistrate Judge.

1                   **II. Issues That Need To Be Addressed Prior To Commencement of Trial**

2                   **Plaintiffs Grober's and Voice International's Position**

3                   **A:** Pursuant to Dkt. 216 Plaintiffs will be filing a Second Amended  
4                   Complaint on or before Feb. 1, 2018 and a discovery schedule will need to be set.

5                   During the meet and confer teleconference on January 23, 2018, Plaintiff  
6                   Grober stated that he is reviewing new evidence as pertaining to naming individuals  
7                   Jordan Klein, Sr.; Jordan Klein, Jr.; and John Dann as defendants in the Second  
8                   Amended Complaint. Although the Court previously determined there was lack of  
9                   personal jurisdiction, on these individuals, new evidence may show differently.

10                  Plaintiffs need to conduct written discovery and depositions because previous  
11                  discovery to Florida Defendants, including OPEL and Dann was limited to  
12                  jurisdiction issues. Defendants refused to answer numerous Requests for Production  
13                  and Interrogatories citing it violated the jurisdiction restriction. Plaintiffs will  
14                  provide these responses to the Court if requested.

15                  As Plaintiffs were forced to take the initial deposition of Mr. Oppenheimer  
16                  prior to being allowed to conduct written discovery on all defendants, and Mr.  
17                  Oppenheimer insisted on leaving the deposition after only four hours, a second or  
18                  continued deposition may be necessary once discovery is received pertaining to  
19                  Oppenheimer's MakoHead rentals and the involvement of OPEL or whomever was  
20                  the recipient of rental income, and/or owned the accused infringing MakoHeads.

21                  Defendant Oppenheimer's argument below does not address the simple fact  
22                  that Plaintiffs did not have the opportunity to conduct discovery on all defendants  
23                  concurrently and that it is believed that discovery obtained from OPEL will raise  
24                  new questions to be posed to Oppenheimer.

25                  The Court has stated there are additional claim constructions for the terms  
26                  "fixed" and "based on" which will need to be decided.

27

28

## Defendant OPEL's Position

2 During the meet and confer teleconference on January 23, 2018, Plaintiff  
3 Grober stated, in no uncertain terms, that he intended to name individuals Jordan  
4 Klein, Sr.; Jordan Klein, Jr.; and John Dann as defendants in the Second Amended  
5 Complaint, despite this Court's order dismissing the First Amended Complaint  
6 against these same individuals for lack of personal jurisdiction. Plaintiffs initiated  
7 this lawsuit on November 12, 2015 [Dkt. 1], but did not name OPEL, Jordan Klein  
8 Sr., Jordan Klein Jr. and John Dann as defendants until Plaintiffs filed a first  
9 amended complaint [Dkt. 36] on June 15, 2016. In an order dated May 22, 2017  
10 [Dkt. 142], the court dismissed the complaint against Jordan Klein Sr., Jordan Klein  
11 Jr. and John Dann for lack of personal jurisdiction, but denied the motion to dismiss  
12 by OPEL. If named as defendants in the Second Amended Complaint, Jordan  
13 Klein, Sr.; Jordan Klein, Jr.; and John Dann will have no choice but to move, yet  
14 again, for dismissal for lack of personal jurisdiction and venue.

15 While preserving objections to requests that clearly exceeded the scope of  
16 jurisdictional discovery, Defendant OPEL produced responsive documents and  
17 answers to interrogatories to the extent the information was available and not  
18 protected by privilege. Plaintiffs' assertion that OPEL withheld responsive non-  
19 privileged information or documents is false.

20 OPEL has not yet filed an answer, has not yet submitted a brief or been heard  
21 on claim construction, has not previously participated in scheduling, has not yet  
22 conducted discovery and has not yet filed a dispositive motion. Defendant OPEL  
23 will file a pleading in response to Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint.  
24 Defendant OPEL will participate in claim construction in accordance with the  
25 Court's order [Dkt. 216]. Defendant OPEL will submit written discovery and  
26 schedule and take a deposition of at least David Grober. Defendant OPEL will also  
27 move for summary judgment of noninfringement.

1 Plaintiffs proposed discovery to close in June. OPEL believes that a close of  
2 discovery in April will suffice.

## **Defendant Oppenheimer's Position.**

4 The Oppenheimer Defendants disagree with Plaintiffs' characterization of the  
5 prior discovery in this action. Discovery commenced in this action on or around  
6 June 10, 2016 after the Oppenheimer Defendants withdrew their motion to dismiss  
7 for lack of jurisdiction and the parties submitted their Joint Rule 16(b)26(f) Report.  
8 Dkt. No. 35. On November 21, 2016, this Court entered an "Order Continuing  
9 Pretrial and Trial Dates" [Dkt. No. 91] giving Plaintiffs nearly an additional nine  
10 (9) months to conduct discovery, including the deposition of Mr. Oppenheimer. A  
11 subsequent Order entitled "Order Setting Pretrial and Trial Dates" dated March 28,  
12 2017 [Dkt. No. 120] was later issued extending the discovery cut-off until October  
13 30, 2017, giving Plaintiffs almost another three (3) months to take discovery. Thus,  
14 Plaintiffs have already ***had more than nineteen months to complete their discovery***  
15 ***of the Oppenheimer Defendants in this action.***

16 On October 5, 2017, Plaintiffs served a notice of deposition for Mr.  
17 Oppenheimer's testimony to take place in Seattle, Washington on October 30,  
18 2017, the last possible date before discovery closed. Dkt. No. 202. The parties  
19 subsequently agreed that Plaintiffs could depose Mr. Oppenheimer on November  
20 20, 2017 based on an agreement that Mr. Oppenheimer would fly from Seattle,  
21 Washington to the Plaintiff Voice Int'l's counsel's office in Southern California  
22 with Plaintiffs paying for Mr. Oppenheimer's flight. Dkt. No. 202. As part of the  
23 parties' agreement, Plaintiffs agreed to start Mr. Oppenheimer's deposition at noon  
24 or 1 pm to avoid having to incur the cost for Mr. Oppenheimer's lodging the night  
25 before if the deposition started in the morning. See Exhibit C. Since Mr.  
26 Oppenheimer would need to leave very early in the morning from Seattle to appear  
27 for his deposition by noon/1 pm in Southern California, Plaintiffs also agreed that  
28 the deposition would not exceed **four hours**. *See id.* ("Let's set a new start time for

1 the deposition to begin at noon or 1:00 pm not expected to exceed 4 hours so Mr.  
2 Oppenheimer can get here in plenty of time.”)

3 Mr. Oppenheimer’s deposition took place on November 10, 2017. After  
4 examining Mr. Oppenheimer for less than four hours, Plaintiffs announced they had  
5 concluded their deposition. Mr. Oppenheimer did not terminate the deposition, as  
6 Plaintiffs now falsely assert. In fact, Plaintiffs still had time remaining within the  
7 four hour period to further depose Mr. Oppenheimer but chose to close the  
8 deposition. Knowing full well that the time to complete discovery was October 30,  
9 2017, and that the deadline to file discovery motions was November 27, 2017,  
10 Plaintiffs also never filed a motion to compel Mr. Oppenheimer to appear for any  
11 additional examination.

12 The Oppenheimer Defendants also dispute Plaintiffs’ contention that they  
13 need more time to conduct discovery involving “Oppenheimer’s MakoHead rentals  
14 and the involvement of OPEL or whomever was the recipient of rental income.”  
15 More than two years ago, the Oppenheimer Defendants produced to Plaintiffs  
16 detailed confidential billing records identifying how much rental income was paid  
17 to Mako and OPEL.<sup>1</sup> If Plaintiffs truly believed Defendants’ discovery was  
18 insufficient (it is not), they should have brought this issue before the Magistrate  
19 during the discovery period. They should not be permitted to reopen discovery now  
20 more than two years after this case began.

21 The Oppenheimer Defendants (including Mr. Oppenheimer) have complied  
22 fully with their discovery obligations within the time frame ordered by this Court.  
23 As such, Plaintiffs should not now have the opportunity to reopen discovery as to  
24 the Oppenheimer Defendants.

25

26

27

---

<sup>1</sup> The Oppenheimer Defendants can provide their financial records to the Court if the Court wishes to review them.

1                   **B: Plaintiffs Note Defendants' Abuse Of The Protective Order**

2                   The Oppenheimer Defendants have mass designated all 608 produced  
3                   documents as "Confidential." Plaintiffs have made numerous requests for proper  
4                   designations. The Oppenheimer Defendants have refused. Plaintiffs were forced to  
5                   file Motions to File Under Seal on three occasions. All three times the Court  
6                   determined the documents were not confidential. (1) Dkts. 102, 114, 115; (2) Dkts.  
7                   135, 137, 138; (3) Dkts. 163, 167, 173, 174, 178, 179, 182, 183. On the third  
8                   occasion the Court ordered a briefing schedule. Defendants, before the briefing,  
9                   agreed to strike the faulty "Confidential" designations to avoid a hearing.

10                  On January 16, 2018 Plaintiff again emailed Defendants' Counsel requesting  
11                  de-designation according to the Court's agreed protective order, for 21 pages  
12                  Plaintiffs were using as exhibits in their MSJ reply brief. These comprised years  
13                  old invoices similar to discovery Judge Kronstadt previously ordered de-designated.  
14                  The Oppenheimer Defendants flatly refused. Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of  
15                  that email exchange.

16                  In total, Oppenheimer has computer stamped all 608 bates discovery pages,  
17                  in six separate productions, "Confidential". This includes at least 18 totally blank  
18                  pages, more pages simply have Dann's contact information. One page just says,  
19                  "Thanks Marty." The Oppenheimer Defendants further designated the entire  
20                  deposition transcript of Marty Oppenheimer as confidential. It is not.

21                  This has deliberately vexed Plaintiffs and multiplied the case load for  
22                  Plaintiffs and the Court.

23                  The Court's protective order, which governs this case, states, "Mass,  
24                  indiscriminate, or routinized designation are prohibited. Unjustified designations  
25                  expose the designator to sanctions, including the Court's striking all confidentiality  
26                  designations made by that designator. Designation under this Order is allowed only  
27                  if the designation is necessary to protect material that, if disclosed to persons not  
28                  authorized to view it, would cause competitive or other recognized harm."

1 Plaintiffs request the Court to strike all confidential designations made by the  
2 Oppenheimer Defendants and order that they pay sanctions to Plaintiffs for the  
3 three previous requests to file under seal. Plaintiffs will provide the 608  
4 “Confidential” documents for a Court review if requested.

5 Defendant Oppenheimer’s argument below is not accurate and does not  
6 address the issues raised above. In short, every time Plaintiffs have identified so-  
7 called “confidential” documents they would like to attach to a filing, Defendants  
8 refuse to reconsider their designations. It should also be noted that while the  
9 Magistrate Judge declined to de-designate she also did not look at them and instead  
10 stated:

11 The Court: ... And, Mr. Mr. Doroshow, Mr. Puri, I will say to  
12 the extent you’ve designated blank pages as “confidential,” that will  
13 be difficult – you will have a difficult time meeting your burden if  
14 this comes to briefing to justify that.

15 Mr. Puri: Sure.

16 The Court: So, I would strongly suggest that there be some  
17 review of those designations to make sure that you folks have not  
18 inadvertently I’m sure – probably much of this is automated in some  
19 ways – overextended that confidentiality designation.

20 Mr. Doroshow: Sure.

21 Exhibit D, (transcript of Magistrate Hearing on 12/5/16, pg. 21, lines 4 – 13).

22 Three times now Judge Kronstadt as seen fit to de-designate  
23 Oppenheimer’s “confidential” documents that have been submitted for  
24 his review.

25 **Defendant Oppenheimer’s Position.**

26 The documents that are subject of Plaintiffs’ untimely dispute were produced  
27 by the Oppenheimer Defendants more than a year ago. Plaintiffs had previously  
28 challenged the confidential designations of 599 pages of the 608 pages of

1 documents before the Magistrate in January 2017. At that time, Plaintiffs also  
2 demanded that the Oppenheimer Defendants complete a worksheet requiring  
3 Defendants to provide a line-by-line explanation as to why 599 pages of documents  
4 were designated as Confidential. By written Order dated January 25, 2017 (Dkt.  
5 No. 107), the Magistrate denied Plaintiffs' challenges to Oppenheimer Defendants'  
6 confidentiality designation to all 599 pages of documents stating:

7 After further discussion, the Court determines that Plaintiffs' demand  
8 that defendants complete the 'worksheet' is not contemplated by either  
9 the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or case law. Further, insofar as  
10 Plaintiffs have not indicated that they need to use any of the 599 pages  
11 designated "confidential" in any motion or pending proceeding, much  
12 less that they have been prejudiced by the designations, Plaintiffs have  
13 not demonstrate any basis for the Court to require defendants to  
14 'explain' these discovery designations. Accordingly, the Court finds  
15 Plaintiff's request is premature and it is, therefore DENIED, without  
16 prejudice.

17 The Magistrate also advised Plaintiffs at the discovery conference, in  
18 response to their complaints that Defendants produced blank pages with  
19 confidential designations, that they *first* advise Defendants which pages formed the  
20 basis of their complaints.

21 Since the Court denied Plaintiffs' request as unsupported and premature on  
22 January 25, 2017, Plaintiffs has never raised any further challenges to Defendants'  
23 confidentiality designations until December 28, 2017, more than eleven months  
24 after Plaintiffs' first challenge to the designation of these documents. By that point,  
25 however, the deadline to file discovery motions under LR 37, including challenges  
26 to confidentiality designations, had already passed by more than a month. *See* J.  
27 Kronstadt's Standing Protective Order for Patent Cases, ¶ 3 ("All challenges to  
28 confidentiality designation shall proceed under Local Rule 37-1 through Local Rule

1 37-4"); *see* Dkt. No. 120 (November 27, 2017 – Last day to file motions (*including*  
2 *discovery motions*). Moreover, rather than complying with the Magistrate's  
3 instructions over a year ago that Plaintiffs first advise Defendants which blank  
4 pages form the basis of their disputes, Plaintiffs have now used this Joint Report an  
5 opportunity to circumvent the Magistrate's instructions by bringing their dispute  
6 over the Oppenheimer Defendants' confidentiality designations before the District  
7 Court.

8 Plaintiffs have had more than ample time during discovery to comply with  
9 the Magistrate's instructions and to raise any challenges involving Defendants'  
10 designations, but specifically chose to not do so. Accordingly, Plaintiffs should not  
11 be permitted now to reopen discovery particularly under these circumstances  
12 involving documents that the Oppenheimer Defendants produced more than a year  
13 ago.

14 **Defendant OPEL's Position**

15 OPEL is not involved in the discovery referred to above by Plaintiff.

16

17 **III. Proposed Dates For Pretrial Conference And Trial**

18 Please see attached Exhibit A.

19

20 **Plaintiff David Grober's Availability**

21 Plaintiff Grober is scheduled for a U.S. Navy ocean research program. His  
22 current schedule has him in Asia and the Indian Ocean on or about May 12 – 30<sup>th</sup>,  
23 2018, and June 20<sup>th</sup> to July 25<sup>th</sup>, 2018. The close of discovery for June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2018  
24 allows for time away, and is well ahead of trial prep and trial.

25 **OPEL's Position**

26 A close of discovery in April, as proposed by OPEL, would not interfere with  
27 Grober's travel plans.

28

3 By: /s/ Robert J. Lauson  
4 Robert J. Lauson, Esq.  
- Attorney for Plaintiff  
VOICE INTERNATIONAL

6 By: /s/ David Grober  
7 David Grober  
In Pro Per

9 FOX ROTHSCHILD, LLP

10 By: /s/ James Doroshow \_\_\_\_\_  
11 James E. Doroshow, Esq.  
12 Ashe Puri, Esq.  
13 Attorney for Defendant  
14 OPPENHEIMER CINE RENTAL,  
OPPENHEIMER CAMERA RENTAL,  
MARTY OPPENHEIMER

16 MARK YOUNG, P.A.

17 By: /s/ Mark Young  
18 Mark Young, Esq.  
Attorney for Defendant  
OCEANIC PRODUCTION EQUIPMENT, LTD.

20 COAST LAW GROUP, LLP

21 By: /s/ David Peck  
22 David Peck, Esq.  
Attorney for Defendant  
OCEANIC PRODUCTION EQUIPMENT, LTD.